



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,721	02/15/2001	Arne Hengerer	P00,1220	2618

26574 7590 03/23/2005

SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
6600 SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473

EXAMINER

GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,721

Applicant(s)

HENGERER ET AL.

Examiner

Luke Gilligan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08192003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3626

Claims 1-11 have been examined.

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claims as recited is dependent on claim 9, however, the claim refers to elements of claim 10. For examination purposes, the Examiner assumes that this is a typographical error and that claim 11 should be dependent on claim 10. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barnhill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,306,087.

4. As per claim 1, Barnhill teaches a networked expert system for automatic evaluation and quality control of medical point of care laboratory measurement data, comprising: a point of care measuring device disposed at a point of care which obtains point of care laboratory measurement data (see column 7, lines 45-49); a central expert system, disposed remote from said location of point of care, and a data link, selected from the group consisting of a data line and a data network, connecting said central expert system to said point of care measuring

Art Unit: 3626

device (see column 7, lines 62-66); and said central expert system being accessible by a treating physician via said data link to function as a virtual laboratory data collection and diagnostic system for acting on said point of care laboratory measurement data to make an evaluation available to said treating physician based on said point of care laboratory measurement data (see column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 16).

5. As per claim 2, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Barnhill further teaches said point of care measuring device is disposed at a facility of a physician (see column 8, lines 8-10).

6. As per claim 3, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Barnhill further teaches said expert system is connected online to a central laboratory for automatically reporting back a listing to said treating physician of secondary examinations available for acting on said point of care laboratory measurement data if an initial evaluation at said expert system of said point of care laboratory measurement data does not produce a definitive diagnosis (see column 13, lines 44-60).

7. As per claim 4, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 3 as described above. Barnhill further teaches the central laboratory reports the results of the secondary examinations to the expert system and the expert system re-evaluates the point of care laboratory measurement data by using the results of the secondary examinations (see column 13, lines 44-60).

8. As per claim 5, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 3 as described above. Barnhill further teaches a request to the point of care is automatically made for providing a sample for the central laboratory (see column 13, lines 44-60).

9. As per claim 6, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Barnhill further teaches a plurality of sub-systems forming said central expert system connected to each other via a data network using data encoding (see column 17, lines 12-23).

Art Unit: 3626

10. As per claim 7, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Barnhill further teaches said expert system includes a data bank containing up-to-date medical knowledge and patient data and acts on said point of care laboratory measurement data using said medical knowledge and said patient data (see column 19, lines 19-26).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnhill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,306,087 in view of Jachimowicz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,763,862.

13. As per claim 8, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 6 as described above. Barnhill does not explicitly teach means for limiting access to said up-to-date medical knowledge and patient data only to authorized persons. Jachimowicz teaches means for limiting access to medical information to only authorized persons (see column 3, lines 44-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this data security means into the system of Barnhill. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this element for the purpose of enhancing security of sensitive data located at various locations (see column 3, lines 52-59 of Jachimowicz).

14. As per claim 9, Barnhill in view of Jachimowicz teach the system of claim 8 as describe above. Barnhill does not explicitly teach at the location of said treating physician, a chip card reader which requires insertion of a chip card of an authorized user in order to authorize access to said central expert system. Jachimowicz teaches a chip card reader which requires insertion

Art Unit: 3626

of a chip card of an authorized user in order to authorize access to said central expert system (see column 3, lines 44-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this data security means into the system of Barnhill for the reasons given above with respect to claim 8.

15. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnhill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,306,087 in view of Stevens et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,599,481.

16. As per claim 10, Barnhill teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Barnhill does not explicitly teach a container for obtaining a patient specimen having an electronically readable identifier thereon. Stevens teaches a container for obtaining a patient specimen having an electronically readable identifier thereon (see column 4, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Barnhill. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature for the purpose of facilitating more efficient processing of handling operations within a laboratory (see column 4, lines 6-7 of Stevens).

17. As per claim 11, Barnhill in view of Stevens teaches the system of claim 10 as described above. Barnhill does not explicitly teach said electronically readable identifier is a bar code. Stevens further teaches said electronically readable identifier is a bar code (see column 4, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Barnhill for the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Art Unit: 3626

**Conclusion**


18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- Doi teaches a dispersed system for communicating biomedical data over a network.
- Coli teaches a network-based system for electronically ordering medical test results.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke Gilligan whose telephone number is (703) 308-6104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5:30pm.

20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
CLG  
3/16/05

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600